IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

FRIDAY, THE TWENTIETH DAY OF AUGUST
TWO THOUSAND AND FOUR

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE V.V.S.RAO

WRIT PETITION NO : 18893 of 1999

Between:

Sri Seetarama Swamy Temple, Satyavada village, Undrajavaram Mandal, West Godavari District rep.by its Executive Oficer.

....PETITIONER

AND

1. The District Collector, Eluru, West Godavari District.
2. Revenue Divisional Officer, Kovvuru, West Godavari District.
3. Mandal Revenue Officer, Undrajavaram, Undrajavaram Mandal, W.G.District.

RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court will be pleased to issue a writ of mandamus or any appropriate writ declaring the action of the respondents in not passing the award and not paying the entire compensation and 30% solatium and interest in relation to acquisition of land belongs to the petitioner temple to an extent of Ac.7-00 in Rs.No.163/2, situated at Satyavada village, Undrajavaram Mandal, West Godavari District as illegal, violative of the land acquisition act and Art.21, 300-A and Art 26 of the Constitution of India besides being violative of the principles of natural justice and the petitioner further consequential prays this Hon'ble Court to direct the respondents to pass final award relating to acquisition of land belongs to the temple Ac.7-00 in Rs.No.163/2, situated at Satyavada village, Undrajavaram Mandal, West Godavari District and futher direct the respondents to pay the entire compensation with 30% solatium.

Counsel for the Petitioner: MR.METTACHENDRA SEKHAR RAO (Not present)

Counsel for the Respondents : GP FOR LAND ACQUISITION

The Court made the following :

THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE V.V.S.RAO

WRIT PETITION NO.18893 OF 1999

ORDER:

When the matter came up before this Court on 16.08.2004, this Court passed the following order:

Learned counsel for the petitioner is absent. No representation.

Post on 20.08.2004 under the caption “For Dismissal”.

Though the matter is coming up under the caption ‘For Dismissal’, learned counsel for the petitioner is absent. There is no representation. Therefore, the writ petition is dismissed for default/non prosecution.

_____

(V.V.S.RAO,J)

20.08.2004.

pln

To

1. The District Collector, Eluru, W.G.District.
2. The Revenue Divisional Officer, Kovvuru, W.G.District.
3. The Mandal Revenue Officer, Undrajavaram, Undrajavaram Mandal, W.G.District.
4. 2 CCs to the G.P.for Land Acquisition, High Court Buildings, Hyderabad (OUT).
5. 2 CD copies.

Form-NIC-OGS/WP{ }